

information to be collected; and (d) ways, including the use of information technology, to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents; and (e) whether small businesses are affected by this collection. The comments that are submitted will be summarized and included in the NARA request for Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval. All comments will become a matter of public record. In this notice, NARA is soliciting comments concerning the following information collection:

*Title:* Online Reproduction Orders for National Archives Records.

*OMB number:* 3095-NEW.

*Agency form number:* N/A.

*Type of review:* Regular.

*Affected public:* Individuals or households.

*Estimated number of respondents:* 13,270.

*Estimated time per response:* 10 minutes.

*Frequency of response:* On occasion.

*Estimated total annual burden hours:* 2,680 hours.

*Abstract:* In December, 2003, NARA launched Order Online!, its online ordering mechanism. With the availability of an Internet-based ordering system (Order Online!), NARA has made accessible online certain reproduction order forms (replicas of the NATF Series 80 Forms and the NATF 36). In the near future, NARA plans to make available custom orders for the remaining types of reproduction services, to allow researchers to submit reproduction orders and remit payment electronically.

The information that NARA proposes to collect for quoted reproduction orders includes the descriptive information (information necessary to search for the records), payment information (e.g., credit card type, credit card number, and expiration date), customer name, shipping and billing address, and phone number. NARA also proposes to offer customers the option of submitting their e-mail address as a means of facilitating communication such as order confirmation, status updates, and issue handling.

Dated: November 30, 2005.

**L. Reynolds Cahoon,**

*Assistant Archivist for Information Services.*  
[FR Doc. E5-6978 Filed 12-6-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7515-01-P

## NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

### Agency Information Collection Activities: Comment Request

**AGENCY:** National Science Foundation.

**ACTION:** Submission for OMB review; comment request.

**SUMMARY:** The National Science Foundation (NSF) has submitted the following information collection requirement to OMB for review and clearance under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Pub. L. 104-13. This is the second notice for public comment; the first was published in the *Federal Register* at 70 FR 54584, and two comments were received. NSF is forwarding the proposed renewal submission to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for clearance simultaneously with the publication of this second notice. Comments regarding (a) whether the collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of burden including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility and clarity of the information to be collected; (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond, including through the use of appropriate automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology should be addressed to: Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of OMB, Attention: Desk Officer for National Science Foundation, 725-17th Street, NW., Room 10235, Washington, DC 20503, and to Suzanne H. Plimpton, Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 295, Arlington, Virginia 22230 or send e-mail to [splimpto@nsf.gov](mailto:splimpto@nsf.gov). Comments regarding these information collections are best assured of having their full effect if received within 30 days of this notification. Copies of the submission(s) may be obtained by calling 703-292-7556.

NSF may not conduct or sponsor a collection of information unless the collection of information displays a currently valid OMB control number and the agency informs potential persons who are to respond to the collection of information that such persons are not required to respond to the collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

*Comment:* On September 15, 2005, we published in the *Federal Register* (70 FR 54584) a 60-day notice of our intent to request renewal of this information collection authority from OMB. In that notice, we solicited public comments for 60 days ending November 14, 2005. Two comments were received from the same person in response to the public notice (the second in response to NSF's reply). The comments came from B. Sachau of Florham Park, NJ, via e-mail on September 20, 2005 and October 12, 2005. Ms. Sachau objected to the information collection but had no specific suggestions for altering the data collection plans other than suggesting that teachers could pay for their own courses.

*Response:* We responded to Ms. Sachau on October 12, 2005 describing the program and noting that these experiences are valuable for teachers because they take back to their classrooms knowledge they gained and experiences they as a result of exposure to the research component of technology commercialization. On October 12, 2005 we received a follow-up reply from Ms. Sachau restating that she dislikes the program. NSF believes that because the comment does not pertain to the collection of information on the required forms for which NSF is seeking OMB approval, NSF is proceeding with the clearance request.

*Title:* Evaluation of the Research Experiences for Teachers (RET) Program.

*OMB Control Number:* 3145-0198.

*Abstract:* The Directorate for Engineering (ENG) initiated the Research Experiences for Teachers (RET) Supplements activity in FY 2001 to be add-ons to active awards funded by ENG programs. The intent was to build on the popular NSF-wide Research Experiences for Undergraduates (REU) Supplements activity by providing opportunities for K-12 teachers to conduct hands-on experiences in the laboratories/facilities of ENG-funded researchers. The assumption was that, like undergraduates, the teachers could benefit from involvement in research and direct exposure to the scientific method, and they could transfer what they learned into classroom activities. Typically the supplements supported one or two teachers. Beginning in FY 2002, ENG has also funded RET Site awards, which are similar to REU Sites in that NSF awards fund groups of teachers to work with faculty members at the same institution and to engage in group activities related to the research. In 2003, community college faculty became eligible as participants in RET

awards. By design, all RET awards are made to the university in whose research the teachers participate.

The initial study of the program just concluded focused on participants in ENG-funded RET Supplement and Site awards in 2001 through 2003. That study resulted in modifications to the RET program announcement for the FY 2006 competition. The proposed follow-up study will be very similar to the initial study and focus on teachers who participated in RET during 2004 and 2005. The follow-on study will examine how RET experience have affected participating teachers' subsequent teaching techniques, attitudes about teaching, and professional development activities. Outcomes and impacts beyond the teachers' own classrooms, such as knowledge transfer activities, formal partnerships formed between the RET Principal Investigators (PIs)—the awardees—and the teachers' school system/district will also be examined. The first survey found that follow-up interaction between PIs and teachers were strongly related to reported positive effects. Accordingly, the follow-up study will explore this aspect of the experience in somewhat greater detail than was done in the first survey. The survey data collection will be done on the World Wide Web as before.

*Estimate of Burden:* Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 15–30 minutes per response.

*Respondents:* Individuals.

*Estimated Number of Responses per Form:* 456.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents:* 206 hours (456 respondents at 15–30 minutes per response).

*Frequency of Response:* One time.

Dated: December 2, 2005.

**Suzanne H. Plimpton,**

*Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation.*

[FR Doc. 05–23708 Filed 12–6–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–M

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

### Regulatory Guide: Issuance, Availability

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has issued a new guide in the agency's Regulatory Guide Series. This series has been developed to describe and make available to the public such information as methods that are acceptable to the NRC staff for implementing specific parts of the

NRC's regulations, techniques that the staff uses in evaluating specific problems or postulated accidents, and data that the staff needs in its review of applications for permits and licenses.

Regulatory Guide 1.204, "Guidelines for Lightning Protection of Nuclear Power Plants," provides guidance for NRC licensees and applicants to use in developing and implementing practices that the staff finds acceptable for complying with the agency's regulatory requirements in Criterion 2, "Design Bases for Protection Against Natural Phenomena," as it appears in Appendix A, "General Design Criteria for Nuclear Power Plants," to Title 10, part 50, of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR part 50). Specifically, Criterion 2 requires, in part, that nuclear power plant (NPP) structures, systems, and components (SSCs) that are important to safety must be designed to withstand the effects of natural phenomena without losing their capability to perform their respective safety functions.

While the regulations address lightning protection for safety-related electrical equipment, they do not explicitly provide guidance concerning the design and installation of lightning protection systems (LPSs) to ensure that electrical transients resulting from lightning phenomena do not cause spurious operation safety-related systems or render them inoperable. Toward that end, Regulatory Guide 1.204 augments the regulations by establishing explicit guidance that is consistent with LPS design and installation practices that are currently applied throughout the commercial power industry.

The scope of the guidance includes protection of (1) the power plant and relevant ancillary facilities, with the boundary beginning at the service entrance of buildings; (2) the plant switchyard; (3) the electrical distribution system, safety-related instrumentation and control (I&C) systems, communications, and personnel within the power plant; and (4) other important equipment in remote ancillary facilities that could impact safety. The scope includes signal lines, communication lines, and power lines, as well as testing and maintenance. The scope does not cover testing and design practices that are specifically intended to protect safety-related I&C systems against the secondary effects of lightning discharges [i.e., low-level power surges and electromagnetic and radio-frequency interference (EMI/RFI)]. These practices are covered in Regulatory Guide 1.180, "Guidelines for Evaluating Electromagnetic and Radio-

Frequency Interference in Safety-Related Instrumentation and Control Systems." Regulatory Guide 1.180, which the NRC issued in January 2000 and revised in October 2003, addresses design, installation, and testing practices for dealing with the effects of EMI/RFI and power surges on safety-related I&C systems.

In Regulatory Guide 1.204, the NRC staff has selected for endorsement a total of four standards issued by the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE), which taken together, provide comprehensive lightning protection guidance for nuclear power plants. Specifically, the four standards are IEEE Std. 665–1995 (reaffirmed 2001), *IEEE Guide for Generating Station Grounding*, IEEE Std. 666–1991 (reaffirmed 1996), *IEEE Design Guide for Electrical Power Service Systems for Generating Stations*, IEEE Std. 1050–1996, *IEEE Guide for Instrumentation and Control Equipment Grounding in Generating Stations*, and IEEE Std. C62.23–1995 (reaffirmed 2001), *IEEE Application Guide for Surge Protection of Electric Generating Plants*.

In February 2005, the NRC staff published a draft of this guide as Draft Regulatory Guide DG–1137. Following the closure of the public comment period on April 20, 2005, the staff resolved all stakeholder comments in the course of preparing the new Regulatory Guide 1.204.

The NRC staff encourages and welcomes comments and suggestions in connection with improvements to published regulatory guides, as well as items for inclusion in regulatory guides that are currently being developed. You may submit comments by any of the following methods.

*Mail comments to:* Rules and Directives Branch, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001.

*Hand-deliver comments to:* Rules and Directives Branch, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852, between 7:30 a.m. and 4:15 p.m. on Federal workdays.

*Fax comments to:* Rules and Directives Branch, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, at (301) 415–5144.

Requests for technical information about Regulatory Guide 1.204 may be directed to Christina E. Antonescu at (301) 415–6792 or via e-mail to [CEA1@nrc.gov](mailto:CEA1@nrc.gov).

Regulatory guides are available for inspection or downloading through the NRC's public Web site in the Regulatory